

Spontaneous CP Violation in the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model at Finite Temperature

Denis Comelli

*Dipartimento di Fisica Teorica Università di Trieste,
Strada Costiera 11, 34014 Miramare, Trieste, Italy*

and

*Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare,
Sezione di Trieste, 34014 Trieste, Italy*

and

Massimo Pietroni

*Dipartimento di Fisica Università di Padova,
Via Marzolo 8, 35100 Padua, Italy.*

and

*Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare,
Sezione di Padova, 35100 Padua, Italy.*

Abstract.

We show that in the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model one-loop effects at finite temperature may lead to a spontaneous breaking of CP invariance in the scalar sector. Requiring that the breaking takes place at the critical temperature for the electroweak phase transition, we find that

the parameters space is compatible with a mass of the Higgs pseudoscalar in agreement with the present experimental lower bounds. Possible implications for baryogenesis are discussed.

The possibility of a spontaneous breakdown of the CP symmetry in the scalar sector of the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM), has been recently investigated [1, 2]. It is well known that, as long as supersymmetry (SUSY) is exact, CP is conserved in the scalar sector of the MSSM. As a consequence, the only CP-violating effects may arise from the soft SUSY-breaking terms: the scalar masses, the gaugino masses, and the trilinear interactions. If one allows these terms to be complex, then there are two new physical phases in the MSSM which are not present in the Standard Model [3]. These phases do not appear in the tree-level Higgs potential, but occur in interactions involving the super-partners of the ordinary particles, giving new contributions to the CP-odd observables ε , ε' , and the electric dipole moment of the neutron [3]. If one assumes that all the soft masses and couplings are real, then no new CP violation appears at the tree-level.

At the one-loop level, the contributions of graphs with sfermions, charginos, neutralinos and Higgs scalars in the internal lines induce a finite renormalization to the tree-level couplings of the scalar potential, which may lead to a phase shift between the vacuum expectation values of the two neutral Higgs fields, *i.e.* to a spontaneous breaking of CP in the scalar sector [1, 2].

Unfortunately it comes out that this scenario is not realistic. The point is that spontaneous CP violation can be implemented radiatively only if a pseudoscalar with zero tree-level mass exists, as was shown on general grounds by Georgi and Pais [4]. In the MSSM this implies the existence of a very light Higgs (with a mass of a few GeV, given by one-loop contributions) [2], which has been excluded by LEP data [5].

In the present paper we analyze the possibility of the spontaneous breakdown of CP at finite temperature in the MSSM. We find that new CP-violating contributions arise from the one-loop corrections at $T \neq 0$, so that the effective potential (at $T \neq 0$) may have a CP-non conserving vacuum, while the pseudoscalar mass, calculated at $T = 0$, is still compatible with the experimental bounds. As T goes to zero the phase of the vacuum expectation values of the Higgs fields vanishes, and the only sources of CP violation remaining are the phase in the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix and the $\bar{\theta}$ parameter of the QCD vacuum. Nevertheless, this effect may be of great relevance for the electroweak baryogenesis in the MSSM, as it could give rise to a new, time varying, CP-violating phase in the scalar sector, whose size

is nearly unbounded by the phenomenology at zero temperature ¹.

The most general gauge invariant scalar potential for the two-doublets model, along the neutral components, is given by

$$\begin{aligned} V = & m_1^2 |H_1|^2 + m_2^2 |H_2|^2 - (m_3^2 H_1 H_2 + h.c.) + \lambda_1 |H_1|^4 + \lambda_2 |H_2|^4 + \lambda_3 |H_1|^2 |H_2|^2 \\ & + \lambda_4 |H_1 H_2|^2 + (\lambda_5 (H_1 H_2)^2 + \lambda_6 |H_1|^2 H_1 H_2 + \lambda_7 |H_2|^2 H_1 H_2 + h.c.), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where we assume m_3^2 , λ_5 , λ_6 and λ_7 to be real, so that CP invariance may be broken only if the vacuum expectation values of the Higgs fields get a non trivial phase,

$$\delta \neq 0, \pi, \quad (2)$$

where we have defined $\langle H_1 \rangle = v_1$, $\langle H_2 \rangle = v_2 e^{i\delta}$.

Eq. (2) is satisfied if, and only if,

$$\lambda_5 > 0, \quad (3)$$

and

$$-1 < \cos \delta = \frac{m_3^2 - \lambda_6 v_1^2 - \lambda_7 v_2^2}{4\lambda_5 v_1 v_2} < 1. \quad (4)$$

¹See ref. [6] for a discussion on the relationship between baryogenesis and explicit CP violation phenomenology in the MSSM.

At the tree-level the parameters λ_i ($i = 1 \dots 7$) are fixed by supersymmetry:

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_1 &= \lambda_2 = \frac{1}{4}(g_2^2 + g_1^2), \\
\lambda_3 &= \frac{1}{4}(g_2^2 - g_1^2), \\
\lambda_4 &= -\frac{1}{2}g_2^2, \\
\lambda_5 &= \lambda_6 = \lambda_7 = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where g_2 and g_1 are the gauge couplings of $SU(2)_L$ and $U(1)_Y$ respectively.

From eqs. (3) and (5) we immediately read that, at the tree-level, CP is not violated in the scalar sector of the MSSM. Since it is the soft breaking of supersymmetry that allows CP violation, the one-loop contributions to the CP-violating couplings λ_5 , λ_6 and λ_7 will be proportional to the soft parameters: the gaugino masses $M_{1,2}$, the sfermion masses $\tilde{m}_F^2$, the trilinear scalar coupling A , and the bilinear one, B . For this reason, we will include in the one-loop effective potential only those field-dependent mass-matrices which contain these parameters. The dominant contributions are given by the stop for the bosonic sector and by chargino and neutralino for the fermionic one.

At finite temperature the one-loop contribution to the effective potential can be decomposed into the sum of a $T = 0$ and a $T \neq 0$ term:

$$\Delta V_{T=0} = \frac{1}{64\pi^2} \text{Str} \left\{ \mathcal{M}^4 \left(\ln \frac{\mathcal{M}^2}{Q^2} - \frac{3}{2} \right) \right\}, \quad (6)$$

$$\Delta V_{T \neq 0} = \Delta V_{T \neq 0}^{bos.} + \Delta V_{T \neq 0}^{ferm.}. \quad (7)$$

Defining $a_{b,(f)}^2 \equiv \mathcal{M}_{b,(f)}^2/T^2$, where $\mathcal{M}_{b,(f)}$ is the bosonic (fermionic) mass matrix, the $T \neq 0$ contributions may be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta V_{T \neq 0}^{bos.} = & T^4 \text{Tr}' \left[\frac{1}{24} a_b^2 - \frac{1}{12\pi^2} (a_b^2)^{3/2} - \frac{1}{64\pi^2} a_b^4 \ln \frac{a_b^2}{A_b} \right. \\ & \left. - \pi^{3/2} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (-1)^l \frac{\zeta(2l+1)}{(l+1)!} \Gamma\left(l + \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(\frac{a_b^2}{4\pi^2}\right)^{l+2} \right], \quad (8) \\ & (a_b < 2\pi) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta V_{T \neq 0}^{ferm.} = & T^4 \text{Tr}' \left[\frac{1}{48} a_f^2 + \frac{1}{64\pi^2} a_f^4 \ln \frac{a_f^2}{A_f} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{\pi^{3/2}}{8} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (-1)^l \frac{1 - 2^{-2l-1}}{(l+1)!} \zeta(2l+1) \Gamma\left(l + \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(\frac{a_f^2}{\pi^2}\right)^{l+2} \right] \quad (9) \\ & (a_f < \pi) \end{aligned}$$

where $A_b = 16A_f = 16\pi^2 \exp(3/2 - 2\gamma_E)$, $\gamma_E = 0.5772$, ζ is the Riemann ζ -function, and Tr' properly counts the degrees of freedom. Eqs. (8) and (9)

give an exact representation of the complete one-loop effective potential at finite temperature [7] for $a_b < 2\pi$ and $a_f < \pi$, respectively.

Taking $\tilde{m}_Q^2 = \tilde{m}_U^2$ the stop mass matrix takes the convenient form

$$a_t^2 = a_Q^2 \cdot \mathbf{1} + \tilde{a}_t^2 \quad (10)$$

where $a_Q^2 \equiv \tilde{m}_Q^2/T^2$, $\mathbf{1}$ is the identity matrix, and $\tilde{a}_t^2$ is the field-dependent part of the mass matrix, *i.e.* $\tilde{a}_t^2 \rightarrow 0$ as the fields vanish. The only contributions to m_3^2 , λ_5 , λ_6 and λ_7 come from the traces of $\tilde{a}_t^4$, $\tilde{a}_t^6$ and $\tilde{a}_t^8$; the traces of the higher powers of $\tilde{a}_t^2$ contain operators of dimension $d > 4$, which are suppressed by powers of $H^2/\tilde{m}_Q^2$ or $H^2/(4\pi^2 T^2)$, multiplied by additional suppressing coefficient coming from the expansion. Inserting eq. (10) in eq. (8) and using the binomial expansion for the terms $(a_t^2)^{l+2}$ and $(a_t^2)^{3/2}$ we can extract the relevant terms from the one-loop effective potential:

$$T^4 \left[-\frac{1}{32\pi a_Q} - \frac{1}{64\pi^2} \left(\ln \frac{Q^2}{A_b T^2} + \frac{3}{2} \right) - \mathcal{B}_4[a_Q^2] \right] \text{Tr}' \tilde{a}_t^4, \quad (11)$$

$$T^4 \left[\frac{1}{192\pi a_Q^3} - \mathcal{B}_6[a_Q^2] \right] \text{Tr}' \tilde{a}_t^6, \quad (12)$$

$$T^4 \left[\frac{-1}{512\pi a_Q^5} - \mathcal{B}_8[a_Q^2] \right] \text{Tr}' \tilde{a}_t^8, \quad (13)$$

where,

$$\mathcal{B}_{2n}[a_Q^2] \equiv \pi^{3/2} \sum_{l=\max[1, n-2]}^{\infty} (-1)^l \frac{\zeta(2l+1)}{(l+2)!} \Gamma\left(l + \frac{1}{2}\right) \binom{l+2}{n} \frac{(a_Q^2)^{l+2-n}}{(4\pi^2)^{l+2}} \quad (14)$$

$$n = 2, 3, 4 \dots \quad a_Q < 2\pi.$$

In eq. (11) we have also included the contribution coming from the $T = 0$ one-loop effective potential, eq.(6). The numerical values of the series $\mathcal{B}_{2n}$ for some values of a_Q are listed in table 1.

We now evaluate the traces in eqs. (11), (12) and (13) and find the one-loop contribution to m_3^2 and to $\lambda_{5,6,7}$ coming from the stop:

$$\Delta m_3^{(s)^2} = +3h_t^2 A_t T a_\mu \left[\frac{1}{8\pi a_Q} + \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \left(\ln \frac{Q^2}{A_b T^2} + \frac{3}{2} \right) + 4\mathcal{B}_4[a_Q^2] \right], \quad (15)$$

$$\Delta \lambda_5^{(s)} = -12h_t^4 \frac{A_t^2 a_\mu^2}{T^2} \left[\mathcal{B}_8[a_Q^2] + \frac{1}{256\pi a_Q^5} \right], \quad (16)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \lambda_6^{(s)} &= -6h_t^2 \frac{A_t a_\mu}{T} \left[\frac{3}{4}(g_2^2 + g_1^2) \left(\mathcal{B}_6[a_Q^2] - \frac{1}{192\pi a_Q^3} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 4h_t^2 a_\mu^2 \left(\mathcal{B}_8[a_Q^2] + \frac{1}{512\pi a_Q^5} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

$$\Delta \lambda_7^{(s)} = -6h_t^2 \frac{A_t a_\mu}{T} \left[\left(6h_t^2 - \frac{3}{4}(g_2^2 + g_1^2) \right) \left(\mathcal{B}_6[a_Q^2] - \frac{1}{192\pi a_Q^3} \right) \right]$$

$$+ 4h_t^2 \frac{A_t^2}{T^2} \left(\mathcal{B}_8[a_Q^2] + \frac{1}{512\pi a_Q^5} \right) \Big], \quad (18)$$

where we have defined $a_\mu \equiv \mu/T$.

Choosing $\mu^2 = M_1^2 = M_2^2$, the squared mass matrices for charginos and neutralinos take a form analogous to that in eq. (10), i.e. they are given by the sum of a multiple of the identity matrix and a field-dependent matrix

$$a_f^2 = a_\mu^2 \cdot \mathbf{1} + \tilde{a}_f^2 \ .$$

We now insert them in eq. (9) and, following the same strategy we used for the stop, we extract the relevant terms in the one-loop potential,

$$T^4 \left[\frac{1}{64\pi^2} \left(\ln \frac{\mathcal{Q}^2}{A_f T^2} + \frac{3}{2} \right) + \mathcal{F}_4[a_\mu^2] \right] \text{Tr}' \tilde{a}_f^4, \quad (19)$$

$$T^4 \mathcal{F}_6[a_\mu^2] \text{Tr}' \tilde{a}_f^6, \quad (20)$$

$$T^4 \mathcal{F}_8[a_\mu^2] \text{Tr}' \tilde{a}_f^8, \quad (21)$$

where the values of

$$\mathcal{F}_{2n}[a_\mu^2] = \frac{\pi^{3/2}}{8} \sum_{l=\max[1, n-2]}^{\infty} (-1)^l \frac{1 - 2^{-2l-1}}{(l+2)!} \zeta(2l+1) \Gamma\left(l + \frac{1}{2}\right) \binom{l+2}{n} \frac{(a_\mu^2)^{l+2-n}}{(\pi^2)^{l+2}} \quad (22)$$

are listed in table 2. Finally, evaluating the traces in eqs. (19), (20) and

(21), we obtain the contributions to the relevant couplings from charginos,

$$\Delta m_3^{(c)^2} = +\text{sign}(\mu) g_2^2 T^2 a_\mu^2 \left[\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left(\ln \frac{Q^2}{A_f T^2} + \frac{3}{2} \right) + 8\mathcal{F}_4[a_\mu^2] \right] \quad (23)$$

$$\Delta \lambda_5^{(c)} = 8 g_2^4 a_\mu^4 \mathcal{F}_8[a_\mu^2], \quad (24)$$

$$\Delta \lambda_6^{(c)} = \Delta \lambda_7^{(c)} = -\text{sign}(\mu) 4 g_2^4 a_\mu^2 \left[3\mathcal{F}_6[a_\mu^2] + 4a_\mu^2 \mathcal{F}_8[a_\mu^2] \right], \quad (25)$$

and from neutralinos,

$$\Delta m_3^{(n)^2} = \frac{(g_2^2 + g_1^2)}{2g_2^2} \Delta m_3^{(c)^2}, \quad \Delta \lambda_i^{(n)} = \frac{(g_2^2 + g_1^2)}{2g_2^2} \Delta \lambda_i^{(c)}, \quad i = 5, 6, 7. \quad (26)$$

Now we are ready to discuss the conditions (3) and (4) on the spontaneous CP breaking at finite temperature and their implication on the mass spectrum of the Higgs scalars. The one-loop effective potential at finite temperature has a CP-violating minimum if (see eqs. (3) and (4))

$$\Delta \lambda_5 > 0, \quad (27)$$

and

$$(1 - K) < \frac{\bar{m}_3^2}{\Delta \lambda_6 v_1^2(T) + \Delta \lambda_7 v_2^2(T)} < (1 + K) \quad (28)$$

where

$$K \equiv 4 \frac{\Delta \lambda_5}{\Delta \lambda_6 + \Delta \lambda_7 \tan^2 \beta(T)} \tan \beta(T),$$

$v_{1,2}(T)$ are the vacuum expectation values at finite temperature, $\tan \beta(T) \equiv v_2(T)/v_1(T)$, $\Delta\lambda_i \equiv \Delta\lambda_i^{(s)} + \Delta\lambda_i^{(c)} + \Delta\lambda_i^{(n)}$ ($i = 5, 6, 7$), and $\bar{m}_3^2$ is the coefficient of the operator $-H_1 H_2$ in the one-loop effective potential at $T \neq 0$, that is

$$\bar{m}_3^2 \equiv m_3^2 + \Delta m_3^{(c)^2} + \Delta m_3^{(n)^2} + \Delta m_3^{(s)^2}. \quad (29)$$

The radiatively-corrected mass of the pseudoscalar is given by

$$\begin{aligned} m_A^2 &= \frac{1 + \tan^2 \beta}{\tan \beta} \left[m_3^2 - \text{sign}(\mu) \frac{\mu^2}{16\pi^2} (3g_2^2 + g_1^2) \ln \frac{\mu^2}{Q^2} - \frac{3}{16\pi^2} h_t^2 A_t \mu \ln \frac{\tilde{m}_Q^2}{Q^2} \right] \\ &= \frac{1 + \tan^2 \beta}{\tan \beta} \left\{ \bar{m}_3^2 - \text{sign}(\mu) (3g_2^2 + g_1^2) T^2 a_\mu^2 \left[\frac{1}{16\pi^2} \left(\ln \frac{a_\mu^2}{A_f} + \frac{3}{2} \right) + 4\mathcal{F}_4[a_\mu^2] \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 3 h_t^2 A_t T a_\mu \left[\frac{1}{8\pi a_Q} + \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \left(\ln \frac{a_Q^2}{A_b} + \frac{3}{2} \right) + 4\mathcal{B}_4[a_Q^2] \right] \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where we have eliminated m_3^2 using eq. (29). From eq. (30) we read that in the limit $g_1, g_2, h_t \rightarrow 0$ the pseudoscalar mass vanishes if we require spontaneous CP violation (eq. (28)), so, in agreement with Georgi-Pais theorem [4], m_A^2 is a one-loop effect. Nevertheless, it does not imply a very light pseudoscalar, as in the case of spontaneous CP violation at $T = 0$ [2]. In fact, the contributions at $T \neq 0$ may be important, as we can read off from eq.(30): even if $\bar{m}_3^2$ is constrained to be of the same order of $\Delta\lambda_6 v_1^2(T) + \Delta\lambda_7 v_2^2(T)$, as required by spontaneous CP violation, eq. (28), the second and the third

terms in the R.H.S. of the last line in eq.(30) may give significant contributions to m_A^2 .

The present experimental lower bound on m_A^2 comes from LEP [5]; it is about 20 GeV for $\tan\beta = 1$ and rapidly saturates the kinematical limit for LEP search, $m_A^2 > 40$ GeV, as $\tan\beta$ becomes greater than about 1.5. In Fig. 1 we plot the region in the plane $(\mu, \tilde{m}_Q)$ in which $m_A(\tan\beta/(1+\tan^2\beta))^{1/2}$ is greater than 14.1 GeV and 17.7 GeV, that is, $m_A > 40$ and 50 GeV, respectively, for $\tan\beta = 4$. We have fixed $\tilde{m}_3^2 = \Delta\lambda_6 v_1^2(T) + \Delta\lambda_7 v_2^2(T)$, which corresponds to the maximal value for the CP-violating phase (see eq. (4)), $\cos\delta = 0$, and also required that $\Delta\lambda_5 > 0$. As we can see there is a wide region in the parameters space in which CP is broken and m_A is compatible with the experimental values. Moreover, we want to stress that our choice $\mu^2 = M_2^2 = M_1^2$ and $\tilde{m}_U^2 = \tilde{m}_Q^2$ has been made only to simplify the derivation in an effective potential approach, but the CP violation is present in a much larger portion of the parameters space.

Since we believe that this effect may play a crucial role in the electroweak baryogenesis, we have fixed $T = T_{e.w.} = O(150\text{GeV})$ [8] in fig. 1. As T decreases the values of $v_{1,2}(T)$, $\tilde{m}_3^2$, $\Delta\lambda_i$, and consequently $\cos\delta$, change, and

at a certain value $T = T_{rest.}$, the condition (28) is no more fulfilled, i.e. CP is restored. It is worthwhile to mention that in this formalism we are not allowed to take the $T \rightarrow 0$ limit in the effective potential, because our formulas (8) and (9) are valid only for $T > \tilde{m}_Q/(2\pi)$, μ/π .

Another possibility is that the vacuum expectation values $v_{1,2}(T_{e.w.})$ in the middle of the electroweak bubbles are too large, so that the condition (28) is not fulfilled (this might follow from the requirement that the anomalous B- and L-violating processes are out of equilibrium [9]); in this case CP violation can take place in the bubble walls, where the vacuum expectation values are changing from zero to the value inside the bubble.

In order to make more quantitative statements on the role of this effect in the generation of the baryon asymmetry of the Universe, a detailed analysis of the phase transition and of bubble propagation in the MSSM is needed. It will be the subject of a forthcoming publication [10].

In conclusion, we have shown that the spontaneous CP violation is possible in the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model at finite temperature, and still in agreement with the experimental lower bounds on the mass of the Higgs pseudoscalar. The CP breaking may take place soon after the elec-

troweak phase transition, and the CP-violating phase may reach the maximal values $\delta = \pm\pi/2$, going to zero as the temperature of the Universe falls down.

Acknowledgments.

It is a pleasure to thank A. Brignole, G. R. Dvali, G. Giudice, A. Riotto and G. Senjanović for useful discussions, and A. Masiero and C. Verzegnassi for the continuous encouragement. We are grateful also to M. D’Attanasio, R. De Pietri and G. Marchesini for the kind hospitality at the department of physics of Parma, where part of this work was done.

References

- [1] N. Maekawa, Phys. Lett. **B282** (1992) 387.
- [2] A. Pomarol, **SCIPP-92-29**.
- [3] J. Ellis, S. Ferrara and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. **B114** (1982) 231;
W. Buchmuller and D. Wyler, Phys. Lett. **B121** (1983) 321;
M. Dugan, B. Grinstein and L. Hall, Nucl. Phys. **B255** (1985) 413.
- [4] H. Georgi and A. Pais, Phys. Rev. **D10** (1974) 1246.
- [5] M. Davier **LAL-91-48**;
ALEPH Collaboration, Phys. Lett. **B265** (1991) 475.
- [6] A. G. Cohen and A. E. Nelson, Phys. Lett. **B297** (1992) 111.
- [7] L. Dolan and R. Jackiw, Phys. Rev. **D9** (1974) 3320.
- [8] G. Giudice, Phys. Rev. **D45** (1992) 3177.
- [9] A. I. Bocharev, S. V. Kuzmin, and M. E. Shaposhnikov,
Phys. Lett. **B244** (1990) 275;

A. I. Bocharev and M. E. Shaposhnikov, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A2** (1987)

417.

[10] D. Comelli et al., work in progress.

Figure Caption

Fig. 1 The parameters space (above the dashed line) in the plane $(\mu, \tilde{m}_Q)$ for $\cos \delta = 0$, $\lambda_5 > 0$ (see text). Contours corresponding to $m_A(\tan \beta / (1 + \tan^2 \beta))^{1/2} > 14.1$ and 17.7 GeV are plotted. We have fixed $A_t = 50 \text{ GeV}$, $T = 150 \text{ GeV}$, $v_1(T) = v_2(T) = 90 \text{ GeV}$ ($v(T = 0) = 174 \text{ GeV}$) and $h_t = 1$.

Tab. 1 Values of the series $\mathcal{B}_{2n}[a_Q^2]$ for values of a_Q^2 in the allowed range.

a_Q	$\mathcal{B}_4[a_Q^2]$	$\mathcal{B}_6[a_Q^2]$	$\mathcal{B}_8[a_Q^2]$
1	$-4.74 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$-1.56 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$1.24 \cdot 10^{-7}$
2	$-1.81 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$-1.42 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$1.04 \cdot 10^{-7}$
3	$-3.8 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$-1.24 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$8.01 \cdot 10^{-8}$
4	$-6.18 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$-1.05 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$5.8 \cdot 10^{-8}$
5	$-8.76 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$-8.71 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$4.06 \cdot 10^{-8}$
6	$-1.14 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-7.22 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$2.81 \cdot 10^{-8}$

Tab. 2 Values of the series $\mathcal{F}_{2n}[a_\mu^2]$ for values of a_μ^2 in the allowed range.

a_μ	$\mathcal{F}_4[a_\mu^2]$	$\mathcal{F}_6[a_\mu^2]$	$\mathcal{F}_8[a_\mu^2]$
0.5	$-8.29 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$-1.09 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$3.84 \cdot 10^{-6}$
1	$-3.15 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$-9.8 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$3.21 \cdot 10^{-6}$
1.5	$-6.55 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$-8.4 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$2.45 \cdot 10^{-6}$
2	$-1.06 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-6.95 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$1.75 \cdot 10^{-6}$
2.5	$-1.48 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-5.63 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$1.21 \cdot 10^{-6}$
3	$-1.89 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-4.54 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$8.18 \cdot 10^{-7}$